material to approximate the original 100-year floodplain. However, the man-made ground elevations of the tailings pile at the Union Carbide site would not be reestablished, which would increase the area of the 100-year floodplain at the processing site by approximately 7 acres. Remedial action at the North Continent site would not increase the size of the 100-year floodplain.

Historical and Cultural Resources

Two cultural resource sites, one near the Union Carbide processing site and the other near the Burro Canyon disposal site, are not expected to be affected by remedial action activities. Both of these cultural resource sites would be fenced and avoided during remedial action, and the site near the Union Carbide processing site would be further protected by a barrier to shield against dust, rocks, and exhaust fumes. If any additional cultural resources are identified during the remedial action (e.g., subsurface resources), work would stop in the area of the cultural resources, and the appropriate state and Federal agencies would be consulted to determine the significance of and protection for the resources. The Ute Mountain, Southern, and Northern Ute Tribes were also consulted to determine whether the proposed remedial action would impact any tribal cultural use areas. No impacts were identified.

Land Use

The remedial action would result in the temporary and permanent disturbance of approximately 335 acres of land. This would result in the temporary and permanent loss of grazing forage at the Slick Rock processing sites, Burro Canyon disposal site, and Dolores River and Disappointment Valley borrow sites. The DOE would mitigate the temporary and permanent loss of grazing forage in accordance with land-use agreements negotiated with affected grazing lessees and private landowners.

The final restricted Burro Canyon disposal site would encompass approximately 57 acres, and any future use of this area would be precluded. After remedial action, the Slick Rock processing sites would be released for any use consistent with existing land-use controls.

Six unpatented mining claims exist within the proposed permanent withdrawal area. The DOE would compensate valid claim holders to the extent required by law.

Socioeconomics

The remedial action impacts on employment, housing, community services, and the economy would be minimal due to the short duration of the remedial action and the relatively small number of workers required. These impacts would be expected to be distributed among numerous nearby and more distant communities; consequently, no single community would be affected substantially by the remedial action. The wages and salaries paid to remedial action workers and expenditures for equipment, materials, and supplies would have direct, positive impacts on the economies of San Miguel, Dolores, and Montezuma Counties. The local economies also would benefit indirectly as these wages, salaries, and expenditures are respent locally on other goods and services. Direct and indirect expenditures would generate tax revenues that would be available to local and state government use.

Transportation

The remedial action would increase the traffic volume on County Roads S8, T11 and State Highway 141. A portion of County Road S8 would be relocated to allow cleanup of the Union Carbide processing site. These roads and highway would be improved as necessary, and other mitigative measures (e.g., trained flag persons and temporary warning signs) would be implemented as required to mitigate the potential traffic hazards. After remedial action, these roads and highway would be returned to their original locations and conditions. The public would be restricted from access to County Roads S9 and 10R and a private disposal site access road off T11 during remedial action, which is expected to last 19 months.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

No Action Alternative

The no action alternative would consist of leaving the contaminated materials in their present conditions and locations at the Slick Rock processing sites. The contaminated materials would continue to be exposed to erosion, and eventual erosion of the contaminated materials would result in the transport of contaminants into the Dolores River. The processing sites and adjacent areas would remain unusable. The contaminated materials would also be susceptible to unauthorized removal and use by humans, which could cause more widespread contamination and increased public health hazards. The no action alternative is not a legal alternative for the DOE and would not satisfy the requirements of the UMTRCA (PL 95–604).

Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The DOE's analysis of disposal site alternatives encompassed technical, environmental, and cost factors, as well as the risks associated with each alternative. Alternatives evaluated but rejected were 1) stabilization of the mill tailings in place at the processing sites, 2) stabilization of the mill tailings at other locations near the processing sites, and 3) colocating the mill tailings at other uranium mill tailings sites. The first alternative was rejected because the major portion of the tailings would be stabilized in the flood plain of the Dolores River and water resources protection would be inadequate. The second was rejected due to the other sites' proximity to ground water. The third was rejected because the cost of disposal would result in significant increases in cost by a factor of two and six, respectively, over the cost of disposal at Burro Canyon.

Determination

Based on the information and analyses in the EA, the DOE has determined that the proposed remedial action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the NEPA. Therefore, the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required.

Signed in Albuquerque, New Mexico, this 27th day of January, 1995.

Bruce G. Twining,

Manager.

[FR Doc. 95–4428 Filed 2–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Office of Nuclear Energy

Nuclear Energy Financial Assistance Program for University Reactor Sharing

AGENCY: Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice inviting grant applications.

SUMMARY: The Office of Nuclear Energy (NE), U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), hereby announces that invitations have been sent to all U.S. colleges and universities with a licensed, operating nuclear reactor that have an interest in making their reactor facility available to other educational institutions.

The objectives of the program are to provide opportunities needed by educational institutions, without these facilities, for research, education and training of their faculty and students in the nuclear sciences and technology. The grants are used to offset costs of

materials, irradiation services, technical services, etc., incurred by the host university. Each grantee is responsible for announcing the availability of the reactor sharing program to other educational institutions in their geographical region.

DATES: The deadline date for applications is March 24, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Four copies of the application should be submitted to: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy, Office of Policy and Management, Information and Contract Management Branch, NE–133, Washington, D.C. 20585.

The application should be signed on the cover sheet by the person initiating the application and by the authenticating university official.

Telephone inquiries requesting information concerning this solicitation should be directed to Mr. E. G. Tourigny (301) 903–3679.

Completed applications delivered by U.S. Postal Service Express Mail, any commercial mail delivery service, or when handcarried by the applicant must be submitted to: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy, Office of Policy and Management, Information and Contract Management Branch, NE–133, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, Maryland 20874.

Anyone interested in more detailed information may write to the address below:

U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy, Facilities Division, Technical Support Branch, NE–443, Washington, D.C. 20585 or call Area Code 301–903–3679.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Reactor Sharing Program derives its statutory authority from the Department of Energy Organization Act, Public Law 95–91, which was enacted to provide for the development of technologies and processes to reduce total energy consumption and enhance energy production. The purpose of this program is to increase the availability of university nuclear reactor facilities to nonreactor owning colleges or universities and other educational institutions—(user institutions). This is accomplished by providing grants to reactor-owning universities (host institutions). These grants provide funds against which reactor operating costs may be charged when the facilities are utilized by regionally affiliated user institutions for student instruction or for student or faculty research. Under this program, allowable reactor operating costs are restricted to the categories delineated below under the heading, Financial Arrangements.

The objectives of the program are to strengthen nuclear science and engineering instruction in the curricula of the nonreactor owning colleges and universities, as well as to provide research opportunities and to enable the application of nuclear analytical techniques by faculty and students in the sciences. University reactors are extremely versatile neutron sources and research facilities; thus the availability of a nuclear reactor contributes particularly and significantly to research and educational opportunities at both the graduate, undergraduate and precollege levels. DOE anticipates that approximately $500,000 will be available from the Office of Nuclear Energy for support of these activities during Fiscal Year 1995.

In accordance with 10 CFR–600.7(b)(1), eligibility for these grants is restricted to U.S. colleges and universities with nuclear reactor facilities because they have a unique opportunity to enable other institutions to participate in important aspects of the Nation's nuclear science and engineering educational programs.

Individual award amounts will be determined by a DOE proposal review panel and will be based on (1) availability of the reactor to outside users, (2) the type of reactor sharing activities and the number of students and/or faculty traditionally served by the proposer, and (3) evidence of interest on the part of potential user institutions to utilize the proposer's facility during the proposed grant period. DOE reserves the right to fund, in whole or in part, any, all, or none of the applications submitted in response to this invitation. Negotiation, award, and administration will be in accordance with the DOE Financial Assistance Policy.

General Information

Institutional Eligibility

Any educational institution within the United States which operates a research or training reactor is eligible to submit a new award or renewal application to participate in the University Reactor Sharing Program. In evaluating applications, preference is given to institutions that can show an affiliation with a substantial number of regional educational institutions who have indicated interest in using the applicant's reactor facility, or who have used the facilities during the previous grant year.

User Institutions

User institutions eligible for participation in the program are primarily educational institutions such as universities and colleges, junior colleges, technical and community colleges, high schools and junior high schools. User groups or individuals affiliated with the host institution are not eligible for assistance under this program. Also excluded are research activities undertaken by an educational institution for which grant or contract funding is provided by other sources. The selection and scheduling of user institution participants is the responsibility of the host institution.

Scope of Program Projects

The projects may range from tours/demonstrations, experiments, workshops and seminars for middle and high school groups to faculty research projects and M.S./Ph.D. thesis or dissertation research. Reactor utilization may range from simple service irradiations and analytical support to basic research studies requiring the facilities' most sophisticated equipment.

Financial Arrangements

Duration of Grants

Funds for the University Reactor Sharing Program will be provided through an assistance grant with host institutions. Charges may be made against grant funds for services rendered to user institutions. The terms of a grant normally will be one year, subject to modifications and renewals.

Reimbursable Costs

Costs for reimbursement are limited to: (1) Payments for irradiation services not to exceed the established, published schedule of the host institution, (2) payments for use of the reactor and related facilities based upon established rates of the host institution, (3) costs of technical assistance furnished by the host institution for conduct of studies by a user institution, and (4) costs of materials and supplies consumed in user institution projects. Charges should not be made to the grant for costs that are already incurred as part of the normal operating expenses of the facility. Laboratory apparatus and instrumentation are not eligible items for reimbursement. Indirect or overhead costs are not allowed. Costs for individual or group travel or subsistence are normally not allowed or encouraged; exceptions are permitted, under unusual circumstances, with the approval of the project director.

Reports

An annual report summarizing activities supported under the grant is required from the host institution. *This report is due within 90 days after the*

end of the grant period. The report should contain specific information in the format shown below.

University: _____ Telephone Number: _____
Project Director: _____ Reactor Type: _____
Grant Number: _____ Power Level: _____
Location: _____

Participating institution	Principal investigator	No. of student/faculty involved	Description of project/program	Reactor sharing support
XXXXX	XXXXX	(Indicate Academic Level)	(Thirty words or less)	XXXX

It is requested that standard size (8 ½ x 11) paper be used.

Application Preparation

An application should include at least the following items.

1. A statement of the relative availability of the reactor to outside users.
2. An assessment on a regional basis of the colleges, universities or precollege institutions that can be served by the proposing institution's reactor facility.
3. Evidence of interest on the part of potential or former user institutions which contain brief statements of interest and plans for utilizing the applicant's reactor facility during the proposed grant period.
4. Applications must include a completed Standard Form 424, ''Application for Federal Assistance''; a 424A, ''Budget Information''; and 424B, ''Assurances,'' as well as the Drug-Free Workplace, Debarred, and Lobbying Certifications.

Terry R. Lash,

Director, Office of Nuclear Energy.

[FR Doc. 95–4429 Filed 2–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Office of the Secretary

Strategic Alignment Initiative; Notice of Open Meeting

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Open Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Steering Committee for the Department of Energy (DOE) Strategic Alignment Initiative, studying the organizational structure and staffing resources of the Department, will hold an open meeting on March 1, 1995.

DATES: March 1, 1995, 8:30 a.m.—5:00 p.m., at the Omni Shoreham Hotel, 2500 Calvert St., N.W., Washington, DC, (202) 234–0700.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Richards or Howard Landon, Strategic Alignment Team, (202) 673–3804.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In December 1994, the Secretary of Energy announced a four month effort to realign the organizational structure, functions, and financial and human resources of the Department. Planning for this effort began with the release of DOE's Strategic Plan in April 1994.

A team of DOE employees, is reviewing the functions and activities of the Department. The team will recommend a more efficient organizational structure that supports the business lines identified in the Strategic Plan. The review draws on private sector experience to eliminate low-priority work, reduce layers of management, and streamline the workforce.

The employee team will present progress reports to the Steering Committee at the March 1 meeting.

Tentative Agenda Items

- Opening Remarks—Secretary Hazel O'Leary.
- Overview and Progress Reports.
- Public Comment Period.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Persons wishing to speak should pre-register at the door. Speakers will be accommodated on a first-come basis to the extent time allows. To ensure that as many persons as possible have the opportunity to speak, a time limitation may be used.

Archer L. Durham,

Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–4609 Filed 2–21–95; 1:20 pm]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–M

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP95–102–001]

Texas Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

February 16, 1995.

Take notice that on February 13, 1995, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets:

Effective February 1, 1995

Substitute Fifth Revised Seventh Revised Sheet No. 10
Substitute Fifth Revised Fourth Revised Sheet No. 11
Substitute Third Revised First Revised Sheet No. 11.1
Substitute First Revised First Revised Sheet No. 15
Substitute First Revised First Revised Sheet No. 16

Effective March 1, 1995

Substitute Sixth Revised Seventh Revised Sheet No. 10
Substitute Sixth Revised Fourth Revised Sheet No. 11
Substitute Fourth Revised First Revised Sheet No. 11.1

and;

a revised Statement in compliance with the provisions in Docket No. RP95–102 as directed in the ''Order Accepting and Suspending Tariff Sheets Subject to Refund and Conditions'' issued January 27, 1995 (70 FERC 61,088).

Texas Gas states that the filing contains a revised statement reflecting:

(1) The aggregate amount of Gas Supply Realignment Costs incurred and allocated to be collected during the twelve-month period November 1, 1993, through October 31, 1994, from Rate Schedule IT; and

(2) The aggregate amount of Gas Supply Realignment Costs deemed collected during the same period by Texas Gas under Rate Schedule IT, as determined pursuant to Section 33.3(g) of the General Terms and Conditions of Texas Gas's FERC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1.

Additionally, the filing reflects an Interruptible Revenue Credit Adjustment which proposes to reduce base rates under Rate Schedules FT, NNS, and SGT, effective February 1, 1995.

Texas Gas states that copies of the instant filing are being mailed to Texas Gas's jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with § 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests